

Michael B. Marion (Bar No. 035627)  
**BYCER & MARION**  
 7220 N. 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite H  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85020  
 Tel: (602) 944-2277  
 michael@bycermarion.com  
*Attorney for Defendant*  
*Loo Tze Ming*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Loo Tze Ming, an individual from Malaysia

Plaintiff,

v.

Fitness Anywhere LLC,

Defendant.

**No. 2:22-CV-02042-SPL**

JFXD TRX ACQ LLC, d/b/a TRX, a Florida  
 limited liability company

Plaintiff,

v.

<trx.com>, a domain name,

and

Loo Tze Ming, an individual from Malaysia

Defendant.

**No. 2:23-CV-02330-PHX-ROS**

**LOO TZE MING’S REPLY IN  
 SUPPORT OF HIS MOTION TO  
 CONSOLIDATE CASE NO. 2:22-CV-  
 02042-SPL AND CASE NO. 2:23-CV-  
 02330-PHX-ROS**

Defendant Loo Tze Ming (“Defendant”), through counsel, submits his Reply in Support of his Motion to Consolidate Case No. 2:22-CV-02042-SPL (“the First Action”) and Case No. 2:23-CV-02330-PHX-ROS (“the Second Action”) (hereinafter “Mot.” or Motion”).

Plaintiff JFXD TRX ACQ LLC (“JFXD”)’s opposition (hereinafter “Opp. or “Opposition”) to consolidation is little more than name calling and table pounding while

1 avoiding the key issue that connects these two cases—that two other parties have attempted to  
2 claim to Ming’s <trx.com> domain name. It makes no sense for Ming, on one hand, to have  
3 to wait to clear title to his property from Fitness Anywhere LLC (“Fitness Anywhere”), while,  
4 on the other hand, an alleged “successor” to Fitness Anywhere seeks to take it out from under  
5 him. JXFD’s case was transferred to this Court for the purpose of resolving the dispute fully.

6 To avoid the core issue that this dispute is over the same <trx.com> domain name in both  
7 cases, JXFD’s scattershot Opposition touches numerous irrelevant issues, such as  
8 jurisdictional discovery that was denied in the Virginia Court (Opp. at 4) or attempts to engage  
9 in “judge shopping” for its case (*Id.*). Ming will respectfully sidestep these extraneous issues  
10 in its Reply, focusing instead on the issues that directly affect the Motion. Ming reserves the  
11 right to respond to these superfluous issues should they become relevant.

12  
13 **I. CONSOLIDATION OF THE CASES IS BOTH PROPER AND**  
14 **BENEFICIAL**

15 The standard for consolidation is met by having two cases with the same transaction  
16 of Ming’s ownership of the <trx.com> domain, the same property, and the same questions  
17 of law under the ACPA. *See* LRCiv 42.1(a). JXFD’s Opposition does not actually  
18 challenge that the two cases present identical factual and legal issues that warrant  
19 consolidation. Instead, JXFD only retorts that Fitness Anywhere is in bankruptcy  
20 proceedings. Opp. at 5. What may happen in the future to one of the parties has no impact  
21 on the present question what would best serve “party economy or judicial economy.” *City*  
22 *of Phoenix v. First State Ins. Co.*, No. CV-15-00511-PHX-NVW, 2016 WL 4591906, at  
23 \*20 (D. Ariz. Sept. 2, 2016), *aff’d*, No. 16-16767, 2018 WL 1616011 (9th Cir. Apr. 4,  
24 2018). Certainly, one consolidated action over the <trx.com> domain would be more  
25 economical for the Court and parties rather than two separate actions before two separate  
26 judges. The Virginia Court already rejected JXFD’s attempt to abuse the litigation process  
27 by filing suit in a different court while the action filed by Ming was pending in this Court.

Conversely, JXFD has acknowledged the unavoidable overlap between the two actions as JXFD repeatedly references factual allegations and proceedings from First Action in its Opposition. It takes quite the mental gymnastics to argue there's no common issues between the First Action and Second Action, when JXFD, in turn, relies on allegations in the First Action to try supporting its claims in the Second Action. JXFD cannot avoid the common issues of fact and law between the First Action and Second Action, warranting consolidation.

## **II. THE CALIFORNIA BANKRUPTCY COURT, NOT JXFD, SHOULD DETERMINE WHETHER TO PROCEED**

JXFD's Opposition conjectures widely about the future of Fitness Anywhere, making numerous unfounded declarations about what may happen to Fitness Anywhere's business. *See* Opp. at 2-3, 5. However, it is not for JXFD to determine the ultimate resolution of the bankruptcy proceeding. Given that JXFD has already acknowledged the proceedings had converted between Chapter 7 and Chapter 11, JXFD's predictions are pure conjecture, not fact.

Given that this Court has already found good cause just three days ago to continue the stay of the First Action in deference to the stay afforded by bankruptcy proceedings (Case No. CV-22-02042-PHX-SPL, Dkt. 25), it would be improper for this Court to subvert the same stay it has already found. Instead, should JXFD believe there was a basis for advancing beyond the stay, the proper mechanism would be for JXFD to seek lifting the stay from the bankruptcy court.

## **III. OWNERSHIP OF THE "TRX" RIGHTS REMAINS UNSETTLED**

As previously highlighted by Ming, Fitness Anywhere brought the UDRP proceeding against the <trx.com> domain nearly two months after JXFD alleged it was assigned all rights in the TRX marks. *See* (Case No. CV-22-02042-PHX-SPL, Dkt. 72 at 4). At no point does JFXD attempt to explain why Fitness Anywhere was able to file such

1 an action. JXFD also cites no precedent about its concerns of having “both the Chapter 11  
2 seller and the Chapter 11 buyer in the same case” (Opp. at 4). Instead, questions over the  
3 rights to the TRX marks appear to be problems of their own creation, not Ming. Certainly  
4 Ming would be entitled to the same discovery, regardless of consolidation. JFXD’s  
5 attempts to shield a dispute over a fundamental issue in these cases—any alleged trademark  
6 rights in the TRX Marks—again warrant a single, consolidated proceeding.

#### 7 8 **IV. CONCLUSION**

9 JXFD’s attempts to fling as much spaghetti to the wall as possible and see what may  
10 stick. However, no amount of distraction can avoid the core concern that Ming is facing  
11 two separate actions in this Court that directly impact Ming’s ownership of the <trx.com>  
12 domain. The considerations of avoiding inconsistent rulings on the same property while  
13 respecting the bankruptcy process is far more important than JXFD’s vague “hardship”  
14 arguing against such need.

15 For the reasons stated above and its Motion, Ming respectfully requests that the  
16 Court consolidate the two cases over the <trx.com> domain.

17  
18 Dated this 18th day of December, 2023.

19 **BYCER & MARION**

20  
21 By: s/Michael B. Marion  
22 Michael B. Marion (Bar No. 035627)  
23 7220 N. 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite H  
24 Phoenix, Arizona 85020  
25 Tel: (602) 944-2277  
26 michael@bycermarion.com  
27 *Attorney for Loo Tze Ming*  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 18th day of December, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will then send a notification of such filing (NEF) to the following:

Anjali J. Patel (SBN 028138)  
Tyler Allen Law Firm, PLLC  
4201 North 24th Street, Suite 200  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
Telephone: (602) 456-0545  
Email: Anjali@allenlawaz.com

Alain Villeneuve (pending pro hac vice)  
1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2200  
Seattle 98101, WA  
Telephone (312) 404-1569  
Email: avilleneuve@trxtraining.com

s/ Michael B. Marion  
Michael B. Marion  
Bycer & Marion, PLC  
7220 N. 16th St., Suite H  
Phoenix, AZ 85020  
(602) 944-2277  
michael@bycermarion.com